



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/036,815	10/19/2001	Wayne E. Fisher	M-11460 US	4940

7590 04/21/2004

MICHAEL P. ADAMS
WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK P.C.
5400 RENAISSANCE TOWER
1201 ELM STREET
DALLAS,, TX 75270-2199

EXAMINER

LE, UYEN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/036,815

Applicant(s)

FISHER, WAYNE E.

Examiner

Uyen T. Le

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The specification is objected to because the information of related applications have not been updated. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 3, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kim et al (US 2002/0059279).

Regarding claims 1, 18, Kim discloses all the claimed subject matter (see the abstract, Figures 3-6). The claimed description reads on the Change List Table (CLT) of Kim. The claimed description stored in the data management block reads on the information stored at the Process Management Block of Kim. Clearly the method of Kim has to determine whether the descriptions are synchronized since the description is used to keep track of transactions performed on the primary database (see 0019-0026).

Regarding claim 3, Kim discloses said copy is stored within said database as one or more database records when Kim shows a CLT (see the abstract).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 2, 4-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al (US 2002/0059279).

Regarding claims 2, 9, although Kim does not specifically show comparing before each access to said database, since the CLT is to ensure that data is synchronized, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the claimed features in order to ensure that the database is up to date.

Regarding claims 4, 11, although Kim does not specifically show a unique location dependent on said database organization, it is well known in the art that different databases possess different configuration. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the claimed features in order to accommodate different database formats.

Regarding claim 5, although Kim does not specifically show that action has to be taken if said copy of the description and said description stored in said data management block are not synchronized, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include such features in order to ensures synchronization of data description.

• Art Unit: 2171

Regarding claims 6, 12, 15, although Kim does not specifically show alerting a user, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include such features in order to allow user intervention when necessary.

Regarding claims 7, 13, 16, although Kim does not specifically show suspending activity, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include such features in order to prevent access to obsolete information.

Regarding claim 8, 14, 17, although Kim does not specifically show suspending activity until said description become synchronized, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include such features in order to resume operation once no problem exists.

Regarding claim 10, Kim discloses said copy is stored within said database as one or more database records when Kim shows a CLT.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Heronimus (US 2003/0046294) teaches symmetrical database data set allocation.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uyen T. Le whose telephone number is 703-305-4134. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00-5:30.

Art Unit: 2171

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

6. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

19 April 2004


UYEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER